

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/811,971

Applicant(s)

GIDWANI ET AL.

Examiner

Mark Fadok

Art Unit

3625

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mark Fadok. (3) _____

(2) Mr. Christopher Lutz. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 19 July 2006.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 23.

Identification of prior art discussed: US 6,626,957.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiner contacted Mr. Lutz to ask for comment on prior art located during a search while in the process of determining allowability. Mr. Lutz responded with the attached amendment and comments which were considered and found to be persuasive. (Note that the provided amendment has not been entered). After further searching, however, new art has been found and a final rejection citing this art is submitted at this time.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent and Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

CHAPIN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW, LLC

WESTBOROUGH OFFICE PARK
1700 WEST PARK DRIVE
WESTBOROUGH, MASSACHUSETTS 01581
TELEPHONE: (508) 616-9660
FACSIMILE: (508) 616-9661
www.Chapin-IP-Law.com

July 19, 2006

From:	CHRISTOPHER J. LUTZ, ESQ.	Your Reference No.:	09/811,971	
		Our Reference No.:	CIS00-3846	
Please deliver the following 14 Pages, Including Cover Page to the following Recipient				
To:	Recipient:	Company Name:	Company Facsimile No.:	Company Telephone No.:
	Mark Fadok	USPTO	571 273 6755	
Comments / Special Instructions				
Facsimile Number is 508.616.9661. If there are problems during this transmission, please call 508.616.9660.				
THE INFORMATION IN THIS TRANSMITTAL IS PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL AND IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE RECIPIENT(S) LISTED ABOVE. IF YOU ARE NEITHER THE INTENDED RECIPIENT(S) NOR A PERSON RESPONSIBLE FOR THE DELIVERY OF THIS TRANSMITTAL TO THE INTENDED RECIPIENT(S), YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT ANY UNAUTHORIZED DISTRIBUTION OR COPYING OF THIS TRANSMITTAL IS PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS TRANSMITTAL IN ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY AT 508.616.9660 AND RETURN THE TRANSMITTAL TO US AT THE ABOVE ADDRESS, MARKED TO THE ATTENTION OF THE SENDING ATTORNEY. THANK YOU.				

Jul 19 2006 12:26

CHAPIN#INTELLECTUAL#PROPE 15086169661

p.2

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: CIS00-3846

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants: Arvind D. Gidwani, Subramanian Srinivasan and Dharmesh Parikh
Serial No.: 09/811,971
For: METHODS AND APPARATUS FOR PROCESSING ORDER
RELATED MESSAGES
Filing Date: March 19, 2001
Examiner: Mark Fadok
Art Unit: 3625

PAGE 2/2 * RCVD AT 7/19/2006 12:00:39 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXXRF-5/0 * DNIS:2736755 * CSID:15086169661 * DURATION (mm-ss):00-42

CHAPIN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW, LLC

WESTBOROUGH OFFICE PARK
1700 WEST PARK DRIVE
WESTBOROUGH, MASSACHUSETTS 01581
TELEPHONE: (508) 616-9660
FACSIMILE: (508) 616-9661
www.Chapin-IP-Law.com

July 19, 2006

From:	CHRISTOPHER J. LUTZ, Esq.		Your Reference No.:	09/811,971
			Our Reference No.:	CIS00-3846
Please deliver the following 14 Pages, including Cover Page to the following Recipient				
To:	Recipient:	Company Name:	Company Facsimile No.:	Company Telephone No.:
	Mark Fadok	USPTO	571 273 6755	
Comments / Special Instructions				
Examiner Fadok, Please review and give me a call to discuss. Thank you, Christopher J. Lutz, Esq. Chapin Intellectual Property Law, LLC 508 616 9660				
Facsimile Number is 508.616.9661. If there are problems during this transmission, please call 508.616.9660.				
THE INFORMATION IN THIS TRANSMITTAL IS PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL AND IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE RECIPIENT(S) LISTED ABOVE. IF YOU ARE NEITHER THE INTENDED RECIPIENT(S) NOR A PERSON RESPONSIBLE FOR THE DELIVERY OF THIS TRANSMITTAL TO THE INTENDED RECIPIENT(S), YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT ANY UNAUTHORIZED DISTRIBUTION OR COPYING OF THIS TRANSMITTAL IS PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS TRANSMITTAL IN ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY AT 508.616.9660 AND RETURN THE TRANSMITTAL TO US AT THE ABOVE ADDRESS, MARKED TO THE ATTENTION OF THE SENDING ATTORNEY. THANK YOU.				

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: CIS00-3846**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicants: Arvind D. Gidwani, Subramanian Srinivasan and Dharmesh Parikh
Serial No.: 09/811,971
For: METHODS AND APPARATUS FOR PROCESSING ORDER
RELATED MESSAGES
Filing Date: March 19, 2001
Examiner: Mark Fadok
Art Unit: 3625
Conf. No.: 9268

Certificate of Mailing Under 37 C.F.R. §1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: **MAIL STOP AMENDMENT**, Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313 on:

Date: July 19, 2006By: Pina L. Butler
(Typed or printed name of person mailing
Document, whose signature appears below)

Signature: _____

MAIL STOP AMENDMENT
Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313

Sir:

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL AMENDMENT

U.S. Application No.: 09/811,971Attorney Docket No.: CIS00-3846

-2-

In response to the Office Action mailed on January 31, 2006, and further to the Examiner Conference of July 19, 2006, please amend the above-identified Application as follows:

IN THE CLAIMS

1. (Withdrawn) In a vendor order server, a method for processing order messages, comprising the steps of:
 - receiving a first message of the order messages over a network, the first message comprising a first extended markup language document from a customer ordering application organized in a first predefined format;
 - directing the first message to a first message processing module of a plurality of message processing modules, directing the first message further comprising parsing the first message to determine a message type that identifies an ordering function for the first message, and directing the first message to the first processing module based on the message type;
 - obtaining a first data set from a first predefined element of the first extended markup language document based on the first predefined format of the first document in response to the step of receiving the first message;
 - obtaining a second data set by processing the first data set of the first message in response to the step of obtaining the first data set, further comprising invoking an ordering function based on a message type defined in a second predefined element of the first extended markup language document to generate the second data set; and
 - providing over the network the second data set in a second message comprising providing the second data set in a third predefined element in a second extended markup language document to the customer ordering application, the second extended markup language document organized in a second predefined format suitable for use by the customer ordering application.

U.S. Application No.: 09/811,971Attorney Docket No.: CIS00-3846

-3-

Claims 2-4. (Cancelled)

5. (Withdrawn) The method of claim 1, wherein the step of obtaining the second data set comprises interacting with an order database based on the first data set and based on a message type of the first message to generate the second data set.
6. (Withdrawn) The method of claim 1, wherein the step of obtaining the second data set comprises performing an ordering function based on the first data set and based on a message type of the first message to generate the second data set.
7. (Cancelled)
8. (Cancelled)
9. (Withdrawn) A vendor order server for processing order messages, the order server comprising:
 - a memory;
 - an input/output interface in communication with the memory; and
 - a processor in communication with the memory and the input/output interface, wherein the memory is encoded with logic instructions for an order message manager application that, when performed on the processor, cause the processor to form an order message manager that processes order messages by performing the operations of:
 - receiving through the input/output interface a first message of the order messages over a network, the first message comprising a first extended markup language document from a

U.S. Application No.: 09/811,971Attorney Docket No.: CIS00-3846

-4-

customer ordering application organized in a first predefined format;
obtaining a first data set from a first predefined element of
the first extended markup language document, the first message
based on the first predefined format of the first extended markup
language document in response to the step of receiving the first
message;

obtaining a second data set by processing the first data set
of the first message in response to the step of obtaining the first
data set, further comprising invoking an ordering function based on
a message type defined in a second predefined element of the first
extended markup language document to generate the second data
set; and

providing through the input/output interface over the network
the second data set in a second message comprising providing the
second data set in a third predefined element in a second extended
markup language document to the customer ordering application,
the second extended markup language document organized in a
second predefined format suitable for use by an ordering
application, the first and second predefined formats corresponding
to the same order being processed by the order server.

10. (Cancelled)
11. (Withdrawn) The order server of claim 9, wherein the logic instructions for the order message manager application comprise further logic instructions, that, when performed on the processor, cause the order message manager to perform the operation of directing the first message to a first message processing module of a plurality of message processing modules.

U.S. Application No.: 09/811,971Attorney Docket No.: CIS00-3846

-5-

12. (Withdrawn) The order server of claim 11, wherein the logic instructions for the order message manager application comprise further logic instructions, that, when performed on the processor, cause the order message manager to perform the operation of parsing the first message to determine a message type that identifies an ordering function for the first message, and directing the first message to the first processing module based on the message type, the message type indicative of the first and second predetermined formats.
13. (Withdrawn) The order server of claim 9, wherein the logic instructions for the order message manager application comprise further logic instructions, that, when performed on the processor, cause the order message manager to perform the operation of interacting with an order database based on the first data set and based on a message type of the first message to generate the second data set.
14. (Withdrawn) The order server of claim 9, wherein the logic instructions for the order message manager application comprise further logic instructions, that, when performed on the processor, cause the order message manager to perform the operation of performing an ordering function based on the first data set and based on a message type of the first message to generate the second data set.
15. (Withdrawn) The order server of claim 9, wherein the second predefined format is suitable for integration into a database maintained by the ordering application.

Claims 16-22. (Cancelled)

U.S. Application No.: 09/811,971Attorney Docket No.: CIS00-3846

-6-

23. (Currently Amended) In a vendor order server, a method of processing order messages by a predetermined sequence of instructions tangibly embodied on an instruction medium executable by a processor responsive to the instructions via an ordering network from a customer ordering application comprising:

defining an order message format having order data elements and order type elements, the order message format adaptable to a plurality of order type elements, each order type element corresponding to a different ordering application;

defining an order response format corresponding to a response expected by the customer ordering application, the order response format corresponding to the ordering application;

receiving, via the ordering network, an order message in the order message format, the order message having an order data set in the order data elements and an order type in the order type element;

parsing an order type from the order type element to identify an order type, the order type indicative of an ordering function performable by at least one of a plurality of order processing modules;

selectively invoking, based on the parsed order type, a particular one of the plurality of order processing modules corresponding to the order type, the invoking operable to route the order data set in the received order message to the invoked order processing module, identifying the order type including parsing according to the predetermined format to identify tagged attributes indicative of the order types, and processing by the order server further comprises indexing a mapping of order types to order processing modules;

interacting with an order database coupled to the order server based on the message type, the order database responsive to the order processing module for transferring data corresponding to the parsed order type;

U.S. Application No.: 09/811,971Attorney Docket No.: CIS00-3846

-7-

processing, based on the interacting, the routed order data set by the order processing module to generate an order response message in the order response format; and

transmitting the order response message to the ordering application, the order response format corresponding to an application database maintained by the ordering application, the defined order message format and order response format accessible to the ordering application and the order server from predetermined types indicative of a predetermined format.

24. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 23 further comprising receiving the order response message by the ordering application and processing the order response message by employing the predetermined types in an automated manner according to application instructions that avoids operator intervention.
25. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 24 wherein defining further comprises defining the order message format and order response format in a predetermined set of markup language definitions commonly accessible to both the order server and the user application.
26. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 25 wherein receiving further comprises receiving the order response message in the order response message format recognizable via the commonly accessible markup definitions that define the predetermined format.
27. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 26 wherein processing further comprises processing in an automated manner that maps data items from the response message at the application database according to

U.S. Application No.: 09/811,971Attorney Docket No.: CIS00-3846

-8-

~~application instructions without manual reentry of data items via an interactive interface.~~

28. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 27 wherein the ordering application is conversant in XML and the order response format is an XML document type indicative of an XML element expected by the ordering application.

29. (Cancelled)

30. (Currently Amended) The method of claim ~~28~~29 wherein the order message format is an XML document definition and the order data elements and order type elements are XML tags in the XML document definition, wherein the order response format is operable for integration into an ordering database responsive to the order application.

31. (New) In a vendor order server, a computer program product having a computer readable medium operable to store computer program logic embodied in a set of instructions tangible embodied in computer program code encoded thereon and executable by a processor responsive to the set of instructions processing order messages via an ordering network from a customer ordering application comprising:

defining an order message format having order data elements and order type elements;

defining an order response format corresponding to a response expected by the customer ordering application, defining further comprising defining the order message format and order response format in a predetermined set of markup language definitions commonly accessible to both the order server and the user application;

U.S. Application No.: 09/811,971Attorney Docket No.: CIS00-3846

-9-

receiving, via the ordering network, an order message in the order message format, the order message having an order data set in the order data elements and an order type in the order type element, receiving further comprising receiving the order response message by the ordering application and processing the order response message by employing the predetermined types in an automated manner according to application instructions;

parsing an order type from the order type element to identify an order type, the order type indicative of an ordering function performable by at least one of a plurality of order processing modules;

selectively invoking, based on the parsed order type, a particular one of the plurality of order processing modules corresponding to the order type, the invoking operable to route the order data set in the received order message to the invoked order processing module, identifying the order type including parsing according to the predetermined format to identify tagged attributes indicative of the order types and processing by the order server further comprises indexing a mapping of order types to order processing modules;

interacting with an order database coupled to the order server based on the message type, the order database responsive to the order processing module for transferring data corresponding to the parsed order type;

processing, based on the interacting, the routed order data set by the order processing module to generate an order response message in the order response format, processing further comprising processing in an automated manner that maps data items from the response message at the application database without manual reentry of data items via an interactive interface, such that identifying the message type involves parsing according to the predetermined format to identify tagged attributes indicative of the message types and processing by the order server further comprises indexing a mapping of order types to order processing modules; and

transmitting the order response message to the ordering application, the order response format corresponding to an application database maintained by

U.S. Application No.: 09/811,971Attorney Docket No.: CIS00-3846

-10-

the ordering application, the defined order message format and order response format accessible to the ordering application and the order server from predetermined types indicative of a predetermined format,

receiving further comprising receiving the order response message in the order response format recognizable via the commonly accessible markup definitions that define the predetermined format, the ordering application being conversant in markup languages and the order response format being a markup document type indicative of a markup element expected by the ordering application, the order message format being an markup document definition and the order data elements and order type elements being markup tags in the markup document definition, such that the order response format is operable for integration into an ordering database responsive to the order application.

32. The method of claim 31 wherein receiving the order message further comprises receiving an order message and order type corresponding to a specific order.

33. The method of claim 32 wherein the order message and the order response message correspond to a common order transaction between a particular customer and supplier.

34. The method of claim 33 wherein the order message and the order response message each have a sender and recipient, such that the senders and recipients of the order message and the order response message are limited to the customer and supplier of the order transaction, and the order message and order response message are not replicated to a plurality of recipients.

U.S. Application No.: 09/811,971Attorney Docket No.: CIS00-3846

-11-

REMARKS

Further to the Examiners conference of July 19, 2006, between Examiner Mark Fadok and Applicant's representative, Christopher J. Lutz, and further in response to the Office Action mailed on January 31, 2006, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration. Applicant thanks the Examiner for bringing the Lippert reference to the attention of the applicant and for the courtesy of a telephone conference to discuss this reference.

Claim(s) 1,5-7, 9, 11-15 and 23-30 are pending in this Application.

In this Amendment, claim(s) 23-27 and 30 have been amended, claims 7 and 29 have been cancelled and claim(s) 31-34 have been added.

Of these, Claim(s) 23 & 31 are independent claims and the remaining claims are dependent claims.

Applicant(s) believe that the claim(s) as presented are in condition for allowance. A notice to this affect is respectfully requested.

A brief clarification of message documents, formats, and elements employed throughout applicant's disclosure may facilitate the Examiner's interpretation. A nested diagram of applicant's message structure is as follows:

INPUT (From ordering applications to claimed order server)

Order input message (order message)

Order input document in first predetermined format (order input format)

Input data set in first predetermined element (order data element)

Message type in second predetermined element (order type
element)

OUTPUT (From order server to ordering application)

Order output message (order response message)

Order output document in 2nd predetermined format (order response
format)

Output data set in third predetermined element

U.S. Application No.: 09/811,971

Attorney Docket No.: CIS00-3846

-12-

The Lippert et al. patent (U.S. Patent No. 6,626,957) shows a mapping of a first predetermined format to a second (XML) predetermined format (col. 6, lines 5-9). The present application, in contrast, claims order message processing according to a mapping of order types to predetermined formats. Thus, in short, the Lippert reference shows mapping from a number of predetermined formats specific to remotely generated content to a common (single) second predetermined format. The present application claims a common order message format mapped and processed to one of a plurality of application specific order response formats in a second predetermined format.

In further detail, Lippert '957 maps many different kinds of content to a single second predetermined XML format, hence depicted a many-one mapping (col. 5, line 59-col. 6, line 35. Thus, the fan-in/fan out of message mapping in Lippert is opposite to the that as in the present application. The present application claims a first predetermined format common to a plurality of order types. The second predetermined format is specific to a particular order type, thus mapping form a single, general predetermined format to an order application specific second predetermined format, discussed at page 6, lines 5-26. In contrast, the second predetermined format in Lippert is common to all formats received from the plurality of content types of the first predetermined format (6:5-8).

Accordingly, claim 23 has been herein amended to recite that, the order message format [is] adaptable to a plurality of order type elements, each order type element corresponding to a different ordering application, and further that the order response format correspond[s] to the ordering application. Lippert makes no showing of a message type in the order type element, operable for routing or dispatching to an order processing module corresponding to the specific order type.

Further, the claimed system parses the order type to determine order processing module to pass the order input message to, discussed at page 12,

U.S. Application No.: 09/811,971Attorney Docket No.: CIS00-3846

-13-

liens 12-19. Lippert does not show, teach or disclosed selectively invoking, based on the parsed order type, a particular one of the plurality of order processing modules corresponding to the order type, as claimed in claim 23.

As the remaining claims depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 23, it is respectfully submitted that all claims in the case are in condition for allowance. Applicants hereby petition for any extension of time which is required to maintain the pendency of this case. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-3735.

If the enclosed papers or fees are considered incomplete, the Patent Office is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned collect at (508) 616-9660, in Westborough, Massachusetts.

Respectfully submitted,

Christopher J. Lutz, Esq.
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No.: 44,883
Chapin Intellectual Property Law, LLC
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581
Telephone: (508) 616-9660
Facsimile: (508) 616-9661

Attorney Docket No.: CIS00-3846

Dated: April 28, 2006